

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/636,138	08/07/2003	Daniel Irwin Amey JR.	CL1049USCNT	9256
23906	7590 11/23/2005		EXAMINER	
E I DU PO	NT DE NEMOURS AN	SANTIAGO, MARICELI		
LEGAL PA	TENT RECORDS CENT			
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	
WILMINGT	ON, DE 19805			

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	i <b>√</b>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Assistant Community	10/636,138	AMEY, DANIEL IRWIN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mariceli Santiago	2879			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are provided by the office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI: 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a coord will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become Af	CATION. reply be timely filed  ATHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31	October 2005.				
	==/=				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		· ·			
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.D	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) 19-24 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5)  Claim(s) 19-23 is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 24 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 August 2003</u> is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e: a) $\boxtimes$ accepted or b) $\square$ ob ne drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority docume</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority docume</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a limit</li> </ul>	ents have been received.  ents have been received in A  iority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) —·			

# **DETAILED ACTION**

# Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 31, 2005 has been entered.

## Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on October 31, 2001, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Cancellation of claims 1-18 has been entered.

Claims 19-24 are pending in the instant application.

#### Claim Objections

Claim 24 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim, or amend the claim to place the claim in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim in independent form. Claim 24 is not considered to be a proper dependent claim since it is conceivable that the product claim can be infringed without infringing the base method claim if the product can be made by a method other than that recited in the base method claim. See MPEP 608.01(n)III.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumar et al. (US 5,601,966).

In regards to claim 24, Applicant is claiming the product of a display panel including a method (i.e. a process) of making a muti-layered cathode backplate structure, consequently, claim 24 is considered a "product-by-process" claim. In spite of the fact that a product-byprocess claim may recite only process limitations, it is the product and not the recited process that is covered by the claim. Further, patentability of a claim to a product does not rest merely on the difference in the method by which the product is made. Rather, is the product itself which must be new and not obvious. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Accordingly, the structure implied by the process steps would be considered for assessing the patentability of product-by-process claims over the prior art (see MPEP 2113). As such, Kumar discloses a display panel (Fig. 5k) including a backplate structure comprising a substrate (72), a cathode electrode (64), made of electrical conducting material, disposed on the substrate, a dielectric material (78) disposed on the cathode electrode, the dielectric material comprising openings exposing portions of the cathode electrode, wherein a plurality of cathode electrodes separated by the dielectric material are formed (Column 10, lines 25-34), and a field emitter material (76) is disposed onto at least a portion of the plurality of cathode electrodes.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 19-23 are allowed over the prior art of record.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding claim 19, the references of the Prior Art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of the limitations as set forth in claim 19, and specifically comprising the limitation of selectively printing a layer of thick film dielectric material onto the cathode electrode, drying the layer of thick film dielectric material, selectively printing a layer of imaging paste onto the layer of dielectric material, heating the layer of dielectric material to effect diffusion of the imaging paste into the layer of dielectric material, removing portions of the dielectric material into which the imaging paste has been diffuse, and leaving exposed portions of the cathode electrode, wherein a plurality of cathode electrodes separated by a dielectric material are formed, firing the structure, and depositing field emitter material onto at least a portion of the plurality of cathode electrodes.

Regarding claims 20-23, claims 20-23 are allowable for the reasons given in claim 19 because of their dependency status from claim 19.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendments, filed October 31, 2005, with respect to claim 19 overcomes the rejection of the previous office action.

Application/Control Number: 10/636,138

Art Unit: 2879

#### **Contact Information**

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariceli Santiago whose telephone number is (571) 272-2464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mariceli Santiago
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2879